REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are currently pending in the application. Claim 1 is in independent form. Reconsideration and further examination of the application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 8-16, 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hollander (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0073375 A1) in view of Botala (U.S. Patent No. 6,868,513 B1). Claims 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hollander and Botala in further view of National Instruments ("Matrix Switch Expansion Guide"). Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Hollander and Botala in further view of Schauss (U.S. Patent No. 5,181,201). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a method for developing a test program in general purpose C/C++ constructs, the test program for testing a semiconductor integrated circuit (IC) in a semiconductor test system. Among other features, the method includes describing test system resources, test system configuration, and module configuration in general-purpose C/C++ constructs for the development of a test program to test the IC on the semiconductor test system. Describing test system configuration comprises specifying a site controller for controlling at least one test module. Each test module includes vendor-supplied hardware and software components for applying a test to the IC, and each vendor-specific software module comprises a module-specific compiler for generating test pattern objects by compiling a source file into a module-specific format for loading on the vendor-supplied hardware.

In entering the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action concedes that Hollander fails to disclose each vendor-specific software module including a module-specific compiler for generating test pattern objects. Instead, the Office Action relies on Botala, asserting that Botala's "Multi-DUT test program 14 ... is *functionally equivalent* to [each vendor-specific software module including a module-specific compiler for generating test pattern objects]. It is the pin data entered into the test program thus customizing it for vendor-specific test cases, thus compiling vendor-specific and module-specific test pattern objects that Botala teaches a *functional equivalent* to the

aforementioned disclosed limitation. Both Botala and the claimed invention *result* in a compiled test pattern objects for vendor-specific hardware." (Office Action, page 9 (emphasis added).)[1]

Applicants contend that the rejection is improper because it fails to consider all of the limitations of the claim (*See* MPEP § 2143.03), and instead relies on assertions of "functional equivalence" and similar "results" (*See* MPEP § 2114). In particular, the rejection's reliance on Botala's disclosure of entering pin data into a *single* Multi-DUT test program 14 disregards the claim language that *each* vendor-specific software module comprises a module-specific compiler for generating test pattern objects. The Office Action's assertion that Botala's pin data and Multi-DUT test program 14 are "functionally equivalent to the claimed limitation" cannot cure Botala's failure to disclose each vendor-specific software module comprises a module-specific compiler for generating test pattern objects. (*See* MPEP § 2143.03; *see also* MPEP § 2114 ("Even if the prior art device performs all the functions recited in the claim, the prior art cannot anticipate the claim if there is any structural difference.").) Therefore, the rejections are respectfully traversed.

The remaining applied references, namely Matrix Switch Expansion Guide and Schauss, are not seen to cure the deficiencies of Hollander and Botala, either alone or in any permissible combination. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claim and are believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

---

[1] Applicants do not concede the correctness of the Office Action's characterization of Botala.

la-984065

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Docket No. 33377-2000800. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: June 25, 2008   Respectfully submitted,

                                                        By /Gregory S. Weaver, #53,751/
                                                        Gregory S. Weaver
                                                            Registration No.: 53,751
                                                        MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
                                                        555 West Fifth Street
                                                        Los Angeles, California 90013-1024
                                                        (213) 892-5399

la-984065